

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 13, 17, 18, and 35 remain pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

Amendment

Claims 19-23, 27, and 30 have been canceled, and claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended to clarify that the size of each of the windows with the number of the windows kept is changed. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 5, 6, 8, 13, 18-23, 27, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Ramirez Diaz (USP 6,476,858). Claims 1, 2, 12, 17, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramirez Diaz in view of Martinez (USP 6,111,575). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramirez Diaz in view of Ishida (USP 5,684,969). Applicant traverses these rejections because the applied references would not have disclosed or taught the window sizing features set forth in independent claims 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, and 18.

First, as to independent claims 1, 9, and 17, in the last reply, applicant explained that Ramirez Diaz fails to disclose or suggest saving the window selection history information. In this respect, the examiner relies on Martinez for the proposition that saving the window selection history information would have been obvious. Applicant believes that the reference made by the examiner (on page 6 of the Detailed Action) to “Mathews, paragraph 0091; User’s interaction with the application is selection history” is a typo, and should not appear in this Office Action. Martinez discloses in the paragraph bridging columns 8 and 9 that the history information can be stored instead of saving different versions of the same file.

Even so, applicant believes that Martinez would not have disclosed or taught changing the size of each of the windows based on the stored selection history information. Ramirez merely discloses the ability to change the size of each of the open windows, as well as the number of the windows. Accordingly, even if Ramirez Diaz were able to properly store the selection history information as set forth in Martinez for argument’s sake, the combination still would not have taught determining the window size based on the selection history information. There simply would not have been any suggestion for determining the window size based on

the selection history information. Accordingly, applicant submits that claims 1, 9, and 17 clearly distinguish over the applied references.

Second, as to independent claims 5, 13, and 18, in the previous reply, applicant explained that Ramirez Diaz would not have taught providing a separate and discrete operation panel window for controlling a video device. In response, the examiner argues that Ramirez Diaz has a general control panel 101,102 that is separate from each sub-surveillance camera window, which has its own control panel that is separate from the general control panel.

Applicant submits that the examiner's argument not only lacks nexus to the claimed invention because these claims call for an operation panel window for controlling the video device that is separate and discrete from the video window, the examiner's assessment of Ramirez Diaz is incorrect. Indeed, even if Ramirez Diaz's main menu 102 and the toolbar 101 were to correspond to the claimed "operation panel window" for argument's sake, changing the size of its camera window (which corresponds to the claimed video window) in Ramirez Diaz, such as from the state shown in Fig. 1 to the state shown in Fig. 4, does not change the size and the display position of its main menu 102 and toolbar 101. Accordingly, Ramirez Diaz would not have disclosed or taught controlling its display unit to change the size and the display position of the operation panel window corresponding to the selected one of the video windows in accordance with the size change of the selected one of the video windows.

Third, as to claim 7, applicant previously explained that the passage (column 8, lines 26-64 of Ishida) relied upon by the examiner states nothing about changing the number of operating buttons of the displayed window, and that Ishida merely discloses scaling down the displayed window. The examiner did not respond to applicant's argument. Since Ishida does not disclose anywhere about changing the number of operating buttons according to the resizing of the window, applicant submits that dependent claim 7 clearly defines over the applied references.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the pending claims patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

14 JUNE 2007

DATE

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)